



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Ceylon was what naturalists call a centre of development, and must have been united, not with India, although but sixty miles distant and joined to it now for a portion of the way by a coral reef, but with Sumatra and Borneo.

This is but one of the many interesting topics which the work before us suggests; and although too little is yet known of Asiatic natural history to settle fairly such important questions as might be raised, we may hope that the favorable reception of this and similar works will stimulate naturalists to pursue investigations which must result in the proudest monuments of human intellect, when man learns to read aright the Book of Nature from the hand of God.

ART. VI.—1. *Memoir, Letters, and Remains of ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE.* Translated from the French. With large Additions. Boston: Ticknor and Fields. 1862. 2 vols. 16mo.

2. *Democracy in America.* By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Translated by HENRY REEVE, Esq. Edited, with Notes, by FRANCIS BOWEN, Alford Professor in Harvard University. Cambridge: John Bartlett. 1862. 2 vols. 12mo.

THE collection of letters which has been given to the world in the volumes before us, will be valuable to the public, no less for the entertainment they yield than for the instruction they impart. They are illustrative, not only of the fine genius of M. de Tocqueville, but also of his private habits and character. The affection which he evinces toward his family and friends, the zest with which he partook of the recreations of retirement, and the discreet attention which he bestowed on minor duties, acquaint us with his domestic virtues. The lofty views of politics and ethics which abound in all his letters enable us to comprehend the depth and purity of his mind. The grace and beauty of their style is surpassed only by their logical consistency, their energy, and the familiar gravity with which the subjects are treated. They seem to

have flowed spontaneously from the breast of the writer ; and, nevertheless, to have been subjected to a strict mental process of discrimination and judgment. They are evidently the creations of a reflective, and yet sensitive intellect, refined by observation, modified by experience, firm in its convictions, and deeply absorbed in the great problem to which the author devoted the greater part of his life,—the future of governments and nations. They are published at a most opportune period.

Ancient political foundations are apparently undergoing great and continual changes ; symptoms of momentous commotions already appear ; and the question whether democracy can or cannot survive the excesses of its own elements, is put to the test with all the severity which a conflict between twenty millions and nine millions can produce. The rapid sale of these volumes encourages the hope that the wise and moderate precepts therein contained may be speedily disseminated through our community ; and this new light may serve to lead us to more rational conceptions of our own system, teaching us to survey our dangers with calmness, and enlightening our judgment as to the means of averting them.

The most valuable portions of M. de Tocqueville's correspondence, indeed, are omitted in the present issue ; but while we deeply regret that M. de Beaumont, the editor of the volumes, should be compelled to deprive us of the observations of such a mind concerning the most important epochs of modern French history, we may readily perceive why the suppression was necessary, when we consider that the French press of the present day is fettered by a stern and cautious censorship. So active was De Tocqueville in the occurrences of the Revolution of 1848, and subsequently, during the suspense which preceded, and was wickedly terminated by, the usurpation of the 2d of December, and so bitter was his opposition to the centralization of power in the person of the present Emperor, that his letters concerning these events cannot be flattering to the present government, or to the principles by which despotic authority now holds the French people enthralled. We are led to hope, however, that, when the future shall restore freedom of speech and action, this correspondence, doubtless

rich in thought and fervent in expression, will be made public, and will give us new revelations of a period now, thanks to the powers that be, by no means comprehended.

In the biography prefixed to the letters, we have a modest and ingenuous testimonial of a lifelong friend, displaying to us a comparatively uneventful, and yet an enviable career. It is undoubtedly open to the censure applicable to so many biographies, that it depicts in exaggerated colors the virtues, and is silent respecting the defects, of the subject. But we may well excuse this partiality in a lifelong friend; still less are we able to deprecate it, inasmuch as the testimony of all who knew him coincides in giving De Tocqueville a character nearly as exemplary as that ascribed to him by his biographer. M. de Beaumont merits approbation for the delicacy with which he has avoided anything tending to offend the sensitiveness of living persons, the good taste he has manifested in the selection of private letters, the accuracy with which he has detailed public and private events, and the earnest desire he evinces to make his work a fair memorial of a life which he considers as a noble example for the imitation of philosophers and statesmen.

Alexis de Tocqueville was descended from a house which traces its origin back for many centuries. The name of the family was Clerel; but, being of gentle blood, they took their present surname of Tocqueville, which is derived from the ancient manor on which they have dwelt for many generations. Up to the middle of the seventeenth century, they lived at Rampan, a small village near St. Lo, whence they were formerly known as the Clerels de Rampan. The ancestry of Alexis, under this name, occupied an honorable, and often an eminent, rank among their contemporaries. They appear to have been actively engaged in political and military events, and to have established a family reputation, which has been worthily sustained to the present day. They were a chivalric and spirited race, and were distinguished for that lofty sense of honor, which especially marked the higher orders of French society in former times. The courtesy, energy, and independence of the ancient noblesse are easily discernible in the character of the scion of the house of Clerel of whose life we are writing.

During the seventeenth century, the Clerels removed to a small settlement on the coast of Normandy, named Tocqueville, possibly from Toki, an ancient chief in those parts. Here the heirs of the family have resided down to the present time; spending their lives in the dignity and ease of landed gentlemen, indulging in rural sports, and assuming honorable responsibilities, looked up to with respect by their humbler neighbors, and occasionally emerging to take a distinguished part in political and military movements. The father of Alexis was heir of the manor, and early came into the possession of his patrimony. During the brief and delusive lull which, in 1793, intervened between the execution of Louis XIV. and the gloomy tyranny of the Jacobins, he married Mademoiselle de Rosambo, a grand-daughter of the celebrated Malesherbes. That heroic old loyalist, after defending, at the peril of his life, the king whom he loved, before the insurgent Convention, had retired in despair to mourn the death of his sovereign, and to deplore the ruin of his country. It was a sad time in which to celebrate a marriage, and the festivities were brief and unostentatious. The felicities of the honeymoon were soon dissipated by the horrors which attended the nation without a ruler; for within a year after the celebration of the nuptials, the violence of the Revolutionists, which everywhere sought the destruction of the ancient aristocracy, descended upon their family; and the venerable statesman, after witnessing the execution of his daughter, grand-daughter, and her husband, Châteaubriand, himself paid the penalty of his devotion to royalty upon the scaffold. Even the youthful Count and his bride were seized and imprisoned for the pretended crimes of her ancestors, and would have shared a like fate, had not the fall of Robespierre restored them to freedom. They hastened from the Conciergerie to Tocqueville, where they found that their villa had happily escaped anarchical fury; and here they resided in seclusion for many years.

Alexis was born at Paris, on the 29th of July, 1805. He was the third son, his two older brothers, Hippolyte and Edward, both of whom survived him, holding by courtesy the titles of Viscount and Baron de Tocqueville. They are frequently mentioned in his letters, and always with warm affec-

tion. Although they have held a respectable position in society, they have not become eminent, and are not remarkable for those high qualities of mind which distinguished Alexis. Although his father was an aristocrat, and in good circumstances, his early education does not appear to have been well cared for. But a love of books was natural to him; and so assiduously did he devote himself to study, when his mind was sufficiently ripe to appreciate the value of knowledge, that he succeeded in entering the college of Metz about 1820; and in 1822 he was awarded the first prize in rhetorical composition. All his tastes led him to desire active, and at the same time intellectual pursuits; and he chose the law for his profession. He was soon appointed Juge Auditeur of Versailles, where his father was Prefect. He had, in the year before his appointment, made a tour of Italy and Sicily in company with his brother Edward, a journal of which we find in the volumes before us. The great subjects which subsequently engrossed his thoughts appear to have agitated him thus early in his career. Instead of dwelling upon the stately palaces and renowned temples, the relics of ancient art and the marvels of modern skill, he investigated the manners of the people, their political, moral, and religious tendencies, their estimation of and capacity for government, and the comparative intelligence and virtue of ancient and modern Italy. He was already gathering that rich fund of experience, and attaining that high capacity for observation, which years afterward enabled him to step, with one effort, into the first rank of political philosophers. His early impressions, derived from a mother who had witnessed the tragical desolation of her family, and who was in the midst of the terrible scenes enacted by the Revolutionists, had made him an earnest and thoughtful student of the causes and influence of those stirring events. He was fired with the contemplation of the wrongs suffered by his kindred and his countrymen, which stimulated him to attempt the interpretation of the great enigma of the eighteenth century. He had learned from the lips of surviving witnesses the contempt of order, the desecration of religion, the fierce Vandalism, and the prostitution of the name of liberty, which composed the salient features of Jacobin ascendancy. He had

himself experienced the degradation of the higher orders, and the subversion of the established *status* of society ; he saw that the dangers of pure democracy counterbalanced, among a mercurial and restless race like the French, the evils of monarchy ; and yet he was forced to admit that liberty and progress were incompatible with the bigoted government of Charles X. Hence we find him, at the early age of nineteen, considering the political condition of the countries through which he travelled, and deducing inferences applicable to France. Having entered upon his magisterial duties in 1827, he brought to their discharge vigilance and acuteness, and soon achieved eminence in his department. But the narrow drudgery of the bench failed to satisfy the craving of his restless and comprehensive mind. As a relief to the tedious routine of his office, he turned aside with De Beaumont, his colleague and friend, to the congenial study of history. The enthusiasm with which he pursued his favorite researches, the sagacity with which he unravelled causes and effects from the dry materials of facts and dates, and the discernment with which he deduced general principles from the habits and opinions of different ages, and by comparing different nations, predicted, when he had scarcely attained his majority, the certainty of future triumphs.

Meanwhile, the political events of 1827 – 8 portended convulsions of an extraordinary nature. The popular party began to manifest symptoms of resistance to the established order. The Legitimists, encouraged by a monarch who, to a weak and capricious intellect, added a stubborn indifference to the welfare of his people, and who did not hesitate to assert his belief in the divine right of the crown, resisted with firmness the appeals for reform which came up to Paris from every part of the nation. Literary controversy and theoretical speculation were fomenting discontent throughout the land. Charles, remembering that his prototype and namesake of England had fallen by yielding, vainly imagined that he could sustain himself by resisting. De Tocqueville, who had studied history differently, and, as subsequent events proved, far more sagaciously, looked upon the course of the king with misgiving, and predicted his inevitable downfall when Polignac became First Minister.

The young philosopher, nevertheless, viewed with dread the approach of another revolution. He saw, on one side, the intelligence, the religion, the moral and intellectual element of France; on the other, an irresponsible and anarchical power, composed of an ignorant and unreasoning mass. While the monarchy was sustained by the virtue, the revolution was sustained by the iniquity and vice of the nation. If the monarchy successfully resisted its antagonists, and built its permanence on the oppression of the people, he could see no hope of preserving the cause of constitutional liberty. If another revolution should prevail over the established order, demolishing with a sudden stroke the *status* which was scarcely recovered from the shock of 1789, followed by a usurpation of fanatics and atheists, with all the disastrous results of anarchy and bloodshed, there seemed but little better prospect of the restoration of tranquillity and freedom. If he had been a selfish man, his interest would have led him to support the crown. His father had been created a peer of France by Louis XVIII. He belonged to the old noblesse, which after the vicissitudes of 1789, and the Empire, had been restored with the Bourbon dynasty. Most of the influence he then possessed, was owing to his high birth and connections. His family had been prominent among the victims of Robespierre and Marat. He was just now entering a career which promised the richest rewards of genius. But with all these influences, he could not support a dynasty which prided itself on its opposition to the popular demand, which was gradually undermining the remnants of liberty bequeathed by the first Revolution, and which feared innovation as the instrument of its destruction. The revolution came: it was accomplished without blood; the king was driven from the capital, and the Duc d'Orleans, his cousin, was raised to the throne. De Tocqueville was neutral in the contest. He now with great reluctance and disinclination took the oath prescribed by the new government, in the faint hope that a change for the better had been made, and that the new king would be forced to govern constitutionally, as a means of safety. He taught himself to bear what could not be remedied, yet did not approve what his conscience condemned. He rather acquiesced

in than supported the Revolution of 1830 ; and he did so with a hesitation which indicated that, while principle remained unshaken, necessity compelled a course which his convictions reprobated.

In 1831, M. de Beaumont, his colleague in the magistracy, was removed from that position by the government ; and De Tocqueville, deprived of his presence and counsel, immediately resigned his own office, and willingly retired from the annoyances of the forum. He was gratified to obtain a commission from the Interior Department, jointly with De Beaumont, to proceed to the United States for the purpose of viewing the penitentiary system. This was only the means, however, to a noble end which he had proposed to himself. He wished to see the only country in the world in which democracy had become reconciled to order and stability ; in which popular education was the regulator of the political system ; in which the highest degree of freedom had been made compatible with an effective police, a prompt administration of justice, and a competent form of government. It was his ambition to view our institutions as a Frenchman, yearning to find the great remedy which should cure what was beginning to be the chronic distemper of his country. It was necessary, in order to comprehend our national fabric, to come among us, to trace back every effect to its cause, to view, if possible, the operation of the system with American prejudices, and to consider with a philosophic eye “ the march of ideas and feelings.” While he devoted much labor to the official enterprise which he had undertaken, his main work was the study of American liberty ; and he studied it not more as a philosopher, or as a theorist, than as a *patriot*. “ America,” he says, “ was only the frame ; my picture was Democracy.”

He devoted two years, on his return, to the composition of the work which brought him, by a marvellous transition, from obscurity to renown. He had not reached his thirtieth year when “ Democracy in America ” appeared. It was at once hailed as the result of a great mind. No European had before comprehended American liberty. No philosopher had before penetrated so far into the problem of democracy. In that work were exhibited, with a strength worthy of Johnson,

and an accuracy which Parr might have envied, the virtues and the deficiencies of popular power. The picture was not more excellent for the brilliancy of its coloring and the beauty of its arrangement, than for the symmetry of its whole, and the vividness of every part. So profound, and yet so graceful, a treatise on government has not been produced in the present century, or perhaps in any century. Frenchmen were proud that their young countryman should distance, in one of the most difficult of sciences, the ancient authorities of other nations. Englishmen were glad to see a work appear which tended to confirm a constitution sustained by an equipoise between crown and people. Americans venerated the man who, alone of all foreigners that had crossed the Atlantic, fully understood a system so much reviled in the Old World, and who had impartially and accurately discerned the merits and faults of a republican government. The book was sold with wonderful rapidity, and was translated into many languages of civilized Europe. No library was considered as complete without it. Conservatives found in its pages arguments enforcing the danger of mob government. Reformers quoted it in derogation of regal authority, and in favor of extending popular suffrage. His aim was, however, to represent to the advocates of ideal democracy and the advocates of established precedent the errors in both views;—to show that democracy without intelligence, morality, and religion, is anarchy and despotism; that democracy reconciled to “respect for property, deference for rights, safety to freedom, and reverence to religion,” is composed of great and noble elements; and that the choice is inevitable between anarchical democracy and intelligent democracy. “Many people,” he says to Stoffels, “of opposite opinions, are pleased with it, not because they understand it, but because they find in my book, considered on one side only, certain arguments favorable to their own passion of the moment.” Triumphant as was the early success of “*Democracy in America*,” as years of experience and public disorder have passed, it has become more and more authoritative; and the prophetic wisdom, the profound logic, and the strict accuracy which dignify every page, have been tested and confirmed by subsequent events. Similar subjects

have been discussed by men of genius on both sides of the Atlantic ; but the greater part are speculatists, deriving their materials from the study of other works and the observations of other persons. They have erected formidable theories, abounding indeed in erudition and acuteness, yet lacking the test of actual experience. But M. de Tocqueville lived in the events, and observed in person the facts, from which he produced the elements of his philosophy. Superadded to an extraordinary capacity for political speculation, he possessed a vivid experience with which to exemplify and enforce his doctrines.

After enjoying a triumph in his own country, which must not only have gratified his pride, but also stimulated his hopes of reform, he visited England in 1835. There he met with a reception, from the first noblemen and writers of the age, of which he was justly proud. The elegant and courteous Lansdowne (who yet lives to adorn society and Parliament, after being for sixty years a chief of the Reform party), the polished Holland, the vivacious Macaulay, and the learned Grote, welcomed to their country one who combined grace and dignity of manner, nobility of birth, and brilliant colloquial power with a strength of intellect such as few Frenchmen have exhibited in any age. His connections with the eminent English Liberals, which then commenced, were kept intimate, as they were delightful, by means of frequent correspondence and occasional visits, to the end of his life. In all his letters, the high respect which he entertained for English institutions, and the affection with which he regarded his English friends, are apparent.

In the same year, he married an English lady, Miss Mary Mottley, to whom he had been several years attached, and who, though she brought him no fortune, seems to have appreciated his temperament and sympathized with his tastes. He constantly spoke of her with steady affection, and never took a step without resorting to her advice. In 1836, the Academy of France, proud to acknowledge the justness of his eminence, awarded a prize of eight thousand francs to his work on America. The following year found him the possessor, by a family agreement, of the ancient manor of Tocqueville. The Revo-

lution of 1830 had substituted a representative government for a rigid monarchy. This change brought with it a corresponding change in the position of literary men. Little pains had been taken by the Bourbons to encourage this class ; much less were they resorted to as counsellors of the crown. The sagacious Louis Philippe saw the importance with which they were regarded by intelligent men ; and the result was, that poets and historians, editors and astronomers, became Ministers of Police and Ministers of Foreign Affairs. De Tocqueville, who had hitherto been known as a speculative politician, now aspired to be a practical politician. He saw the class in which he had ranked himself accepting seals of office, offering themselves for the Chamber, and representing France at foreign courts. He was now a feudal proprietor ; and this advantage, combined with his literary eminence, encouraged him to enter the troubled arena. At the election of 1837, therefore, he presented himself to the Arrondissement of Valognes as a candidate for the Chamber. His kinsman, Count Molé, then at the head of the government, offered to support him with all the influence of the ministry, and without his knowledge took measures to carry the election in his favor. But De Tocqueville, with a lofty spirit seldom seen in candidates for office, manfully rejected the aid thus offered ; and, the cry of "No nobles !" having been raised against him, he was defeated. Liberal as were his ideas on government, he could not induce the bigoted Norman peasantry to look beyond his birth, to his character and merit.

He now devoted himself to cultivating the esteem of his neighbors, to improving the surroundings of his villa, to the pleasing duties of hospitality, and to the continuation of the great work, the published portions of which had so abundantly rewarded him. In 1838 the Academy of Moral and Political Science did itself honor, and him justice, by enrolling his name as one of its members. The biennial election again approached in 1839, when, so successful had he been in disabusing the district of prejudices against him, and in endearing himself to its people by the simple courtesy of his manners, he was elected by a large majority to the highest legislative position in France. He continued to represent

Valoques in the Chamber of Deputies from 1839 to the breaking up of thrones and legislatures in 1848.

He found, upon taking his seat, that the Chamber was divided into three distinct parties, — the ministerial party, the dynastic opposition, and the republican opposition. At the head of the former were M. Guizot and M. Molé, and they supported the royal family then in power. The dynastic opposition were under the lead of Thiers and Odillon Barrot. They were the constitutional opposition, acquiescent in the present establishment, but opposed to the particular measures of the ministry then in place. The republicans were not only opposed to the present dynasty, but to all dynasties, and were willing and zealous disciples of the old Revolutionists. The freedom of the press had never been greater than it was at this time ; consequently parties of all shades waged incessant warfare, and the fiercest fanatics did not hesitate to avow their extreme doctrines in the forum and through the press. De Tocqueville, having before his eyes the example of England, — that example to which he ever tried to induce France to approximate, — and from a fear that either the crown or the republicans might acquire too much power, determined to throw his influence into the balancing party, and enrolled himself under the leadership of Thiers and Barrot. While, on the whole, he considered it essential to the liberties of France to support the Orleanists at the Tuileries, he thought that a dynastic opposition would operate to restrain while it sustained, and, at the same time keeping the republicans in a hopeless minority, to force the king to a constitutional reign. While he continued Deputy, he was intrusted with various responsible duties, among others, with that of reporting, in 1839, on the abolition of colonial slavery ; in 1840, on prison reform ; and in 1846, on African colonization. In 1840, he issued the last two volumes of "Democracy in America," which were received with as great approbation as had greeted the former issue ; and in the following year he had the gratification of being elected a member of the Academy of France. As a relaxation from the severe duties of the Chamber, he travelled, in 1841, and again in 1845, through Algeria. His letters from that country are full of interest, and evince that

sagacious comprehension of politics which was so remarkable in him.

His friends had expected, when he was returned to the legislature, that he would rise at once to the front ranks of his party. But those expectations were, in a great measure, disappointed. He not only did not become a leader, he did not become even prominent in the debates of the Chamber. The eloquence which had flowed so easily from his pen now failed him, as he stood upon his feet and attempted to harangue the dignified Deputies of France. It was not surprising, however, that one who had been a great writer did not succeed as a speaker. He had memorable precedents, to which he might point, to excuse his failure. Such men as Addison, Johnson, Jefferson, and Scott, all political writers of the first ability, had entirely failed when called upon to speak in public. His temper, which was impetuous to a fault, his care to avoid commonplaces, his deliberate search after deep thought, the delicacy of his frame, and the entirely novel position in which he found himself, added to a weak voice, were adequate reasons for his deficiency as an orator. Notwithstanding, however, that his labors could not be of service to his cause in forensic discussion, the conservative and deliberative cast of his mind produced an influence on his colleagues far from contemptible. In private discussions with his political friends, he pointed out to them, with rare acuteness, the dangers which beset the monarchy and liberty. To him they resorted when an important vote was to be decided, or an important measure introduced; and although, unhappily for them and for France, they did not always follow his counsel, they listened to it with attention and respect.

The breach between the king's friends, headed by Guizot, on the one side, and the dynastic and the revolutionary opposition, now apparently united, on the other, was continually widening from 1840 to the time of the king's downfall. Odilon Barrot hoped that, by uniting with the radicals, and thereby outvoting the ministry, he might be able to limit, without destroying, the royal prerogative. He vainly thought that, after concessions had been forced by the aid of his allies, he might easily abandon them, and, supported by the nation,

accede to power without detriment to the monarchy. The issue which he made with the ministry was reform in the court and in elections. The revolutionists, under the leading of such men as Ledru-Rollin, Marrast, Arago, and Louis Blanc, now entered upon the rapid execution of the projects which had long busied their fevered brains, and caught at the first opportunity of their fulfilment. Carrying along with them in their impetuous career their unwilling allies, they began to incite the nation to a desperate resistance, and to preach the old doctrines of equality and liberty to the ignorant and disaffected. The government, looking with natural dread upon the disturbances thus created, forbade the holding of public meetings. Fertile in expedient and fearless in action, the agitators contrived that banquets should be held throughout France; and at these assemblages they harangued with redoubled violence and fury. Barrot and Thiers began to tremble at the excesses which their rashness had brought into existence. But it was too late. They could break down the barrier, but they could not again rear it to oppose the impetuous flood. The time had come when the weaker element of conservatism in the coalition was drowned in the desperate measures of the levellers.

De Tocqueville saw the approach of the tempest months before it burst upon the country. In January he addressed the Chamber in a prophetic warning, which amazed the deputies. After pointing to the disturbances which agitated the nation, and the causes of those disturbances, he said: "We are slumbering on a volcano: I am certain of it." Events soon occurred which stamped him as a true prophet. A grand national banquet was announced to take place in Paris. The insurrectionists were to erect their standards of rebellion under the very shadow of the Tuileries. Barrot attempted to compromise; Rollin and Blanc were inexorable. Guizot offered to resign, and Barrot was intrusted with a brief interval of power. But the outbreak was ripe, and revolution again triumphed over monarch, ministers, and legislators. The king, with the royal family, fled through his garden, as the mob were thundering at the portals of the palace. France was once more without a ruler. And now came in all that

race of hypocrites who exercised power under the visor of liberty,—exalting the populace of Paris over the citizens of France,—bent on abolishing royalty, debasing the nobility, equalizing all ranks, and levelling property and power to a common grade. Ledru-Rollin, at the head of a band of rioters, overawed and expelled the Deputies, and read a list of the Provisional Government, including with himself the wildest zealots of his faction, from the poetical Lamartine to Albert the laborer. This administration, self-created, and sustained only by the dregs of Paris, repaired to the head-quarters of the government, and began to shape their policy by the promulgation of the Utopian systems, the advocacy of which had attached to them the ignorant and deluded laboring classes of the capital.

De Tocqueville clearly discerned the dangers of the nation, and instantly declared that its only safety was in the prompt erection of a constitutional republic. He considered the evils of political frenzy less dangerous than the ignorance of the people “as to the real conditions of production and social prosperity.” A continuation of the social despotism which now held possession of the sinews of government must, he saw, eventually lead the nation again to imperial rule, as it had done before in 1789. An election for a Constituent Assembly was ordered; and on the 4th of May De Tocqueville was returned to it by his neighborhood of La Manche. To the surprise and chagrin of the Provisional Government, this body contained a large majority of conservative and moderate men. The revolutionists found themselves in a hopeless minority. De Tocqueville, with other leaders of the advocates of order and system, now earnestly strove to establish a republic. The Constituent Assembly, completely united, and determined to resist Parisian tyranny, promptly appointed a committee to frame a constitution with a republican form. Upon this committee De Tocqueville was placed, and became a leading member. But the chaotic elements into which society had been broken were not yet reduced to harmony; and the Republic, unsupported by the steady, zealous, and energetic approval of the nation, only prepared the way for a catastrophe which De Tocqueville had been anxious to avert by its means. The

election of President resulted in the choice of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, a man who, as De Tocqueville himself said, "believes in his own hereditary right in the crown as firmly as Charles X. himself." De Tocqueville had voted for General Cavaignac, the opposing candidate, because he dreaded the accession of a Bonaparte, and looked with especial distrust upon the character of the prince who now solicited popular support.

Soon after his instalment into office, Napoleon requested an interview with De Tocqueville, and endeavored, by treating him with marked civility, to persuade him into the adoption of his own views. But the shrewd statesman penetrated the design of the President, and refused to become a passive tool for the erection of despotism over the heads of the people. The conservatives, although disheartened at the evident tendencies of the new powers, resolved to make one more effort for a constitutional establishment. They hoped that, by persuading the President to adopt the principle of free parliaments and responsible ministries, he might be induced to forego the effort to obtain the uncertain authority of absolute power. With this laudable view, Odillon Barrot, in June, 1849, undertook the functions of prime minister. Eminent conservatives were intrusted with the ministerial seals. De Tocqueville, much to Barrot's honor, received and accepted the portfolio of the Foreign Office. The people began to imagine symptoms of permanent peace and order. Every one now took heart at the encouraging signs of restored tranquillity.

The Foreign Secretary found that he had assumed, with his new office, duties of unusual magnitude. Besides the deliberations which devolved upon him as a member of the cabinet council, which, at this early stage of affairs, were of the utmost importance, he was obliged to turn his attention to the settlement of the Roman question, and also of the controversy regarding the Hungarian refugees who were claimed from Turkey by Russia and Austria. To reconcile other nations to the occupation of the Eternal City by French troops, to disabuse foreign courts of the idea that this occupation was for conquest and not for protection, and to interfere between

three powerful courts in a question of the greatest delicacy and difficulty, required a clear and vigorous intellect, and a determined purpose. Of these tasks he acquitted himself with high credit. His despatches are perspicuous and energetic, sagacious and far-sighted. In the retirement of his study he could easily wield a power which had been denied him in the Chamber. His knowledge of passing political events, and the deep attention with which he had contemplated the history of nations, made him a complete master of his subject. The candor and ingenuousness with which he negotiated with foreign powers commanded their respect and elicited their confidence. The moderation of his views, and the remarkable foresight which had distinguished him throughout his career, called forth a reliance on his efficiency in the execution of his trust, both from his colleagues and from the people. His experience in office, however, though creditable, was brief; for it soon became apparent that Napoleon was determined to govern without the restraint of a responsible ministry. Finding that every attempt to legitimize his projected measures was vain, the Barrot ministry retired from power in October, 1849,—the technical issue being in regard to the Roman expedition. By their downfall the last hopes of preserving constitutional stability were crushed.

De Tocqueville, desponding, and shattered in health, now left France for Italy, and spent the winter at Sorrento, where he employed himself in recovering physical strength, observing from a distance the course of events, and writing the early portions of a work which he had long contemplated, on the causes of the first Revolution. On his return to France, he found the Assembly and the press agitated by discussions relative to a revision of the Constitution of 1848. The period designated for the election of President approached. The incumbent was bent on retaining his power; and whether it should be retained by a desperate *coup d'état*, or by abolishing the restriction in the Constitution which prohibited his re-election, it was for the Assembly to determine. Resistance by that body to the proposed revision was precipitating the nation into immediate and certain despotism. Compliance with it made such a result a question of time. De Tocqueville saw

that the choice was between faint hope and no hope. Without hesitation, when his mind was clear, he advocated a revision, and he was himself intrusted in committee with framing a report favorable to that measure. Feeble as the chance was of preserving the Republic, he saw that to make the acts of the President constitutional was the only chance. His description of the Constitution of 1848, in his report, is drawn with so masterly a hand, that we cannot refrain from presenting it to our readers:—

“A single Chamber exclusively entitled to make laws, a single man exclusively entitled to preside over the application of all laws, and the direction of all public affairs, each of them elected directly by universal suffrage; the Assembly omnipotent within the limits of the Constitution; the President required, within those limits, to obey the Assembly, but wielding, from the nature of his election, a moral force which makes his submission uneasy, and must suggest to him resistance, and possessed of all the prerogatives which belong to an executive in a country in which the central administration, everywhere active and everywhere powerful, has been created by monarchs and for the purposes of monarchy;—these two great powers, equal as to their origin, unequal as to their rights, condemned by law to coerce one another, invited by law to mutual suspicion, mutual jealousy, and mutual contest, yet forced to live in close embrace, in an eternal *tête-à-tête*, without a third power, or even an umpire to mediate and restrain them,—these are not conditions under which a government can be regular or strong.”

The efforts of the constitutionalists proved of no avail. The inordinate ambition of Napoleon now only sought an opportunity to seize the absolute control over the nation. De Tocqueville, who had before predicted both of the Revolutions, foresaw the impending blow to the Assembly. He was seated among his colleagues in deliberation when the *coup d'état* took place. On the morning of the 2d of December, the President took possession, by military force, of all the government offices. An armed troop of soldiery came to the Assembly, and De Tocqueville, in company with two hundred of the *élite* of France, was marched to the Quai d'Orsay, and thence conveyed to Vincennes. Napoleon now rapidly consolidated the Empire. A constrained ballot afforded a pretence for his

measures. The Assembly was abolished, the press fettered, Lamartine and Hugo exiled, a standing army established, and every precaution taken to secure a permanent despotism. When the plans of the Emperor had been reduced to system, the imprisoned legislators were released.

This tyrannical seizure and confinement was the last scene in the political life of M. de Tocqueville. The result to which he had looked forward with dismay had now followed from the Revolution of 1848. The people of France, wearied with the continual turmoil of anarchy, and grown apathetic in the license which had long prevailed, had at last quietly and slavishly submitted their necks to the yoke of the oppressor. The day in which patriots could exert themselves was passed. All that remained for him now was to retire to his country-seat, to banish politics from his thoughts, to devote his time to the quiet walks of literature and agriculture, and to alleviate the condition and augment the happiness of those humble neighbors who had been so long faithful to him. He continued the execution of his work on the Revolution of 1789 as rapidly as his frail health would permit, and published the first part of it in 1856. The rest was never finished. For purposes of research and study he visited St. Cyr in 1854, and Germany in 1855. He also in 1857 visited England for the last time, where he was received with distinguished consideration, and whence a government vessel was specially commissioned to reconvey him to Normandy. He devoted himself with zest to agricultural improvements, for which, in the restlessness of his early days, he had acquired a dislike. Now, after an active and stormy life, his mind had become calm, and his love of nature contributed to give a relish to rural occupations. Although he had retired from public service, he never ceased to practise the maxim which we find in his letters, — "There is only one great object in this world which deserves our efforts, and that is the good of mankind." He considered life as of but little worth, except as it is made valuable by being employed in doing one's duty, and serving men, and in "taking one's fit place among them." His charity was free and liberal, his advice never refused, when solicited; his kindness and affability were constant and uni-

versal; his interest in the prosperity of others genuine and enthusiastic. Thus usefully and happily were his last years passed; and as he had spent a laborious life in improving public sentiment, exalting religious and educational influences, and striving to secure to his countrymen an equipoise of liberty and stability, the evening of his sojourn upon earth was devoted to the alleviation of individual distress, and the exercise of an active and incessant benevolence.

The delicate body, which had sustained so many inroads upon its strength, now began to yield to disease. In June, 1858, he broke a blood-vessel, — an event which, although at the time it was not regarded as fatal, accelerated the final catastrophe. The bleak shores of Normandy were ill suited to an invalid afflicted with pulmonary weakness, and he repaired to Cannes in the South of France, buoyed up with the hope that the softer air and more equable climate of that region might restore him to vigor. There, although confined most of the time to his villa, he continued those studies which had mainly contributed to his happiness through life, and remained in delightful communion with the eminent persons who resided near him. Lord Brougham and Chevalier Bunsen contributed to while away many weary hours by their considerate attentions to the dying statesman. After weeks of protracted suffering, aggravated by the illness of his wife, but sustained with patience by a meek and cheerful spirit, he passed away, with tranquillity and in the complete exercise of his faculties, surrounded by his best-beloved friends, on the 16th of April, 1859. Although till within a few days of his departure he had never ceased to look forward to a resumption of his labors, the humility with which he acquiesced in the solemn disappointment, and the fervent piety with which he confided in his Saviour, made a lasting impression upon those who witnessed that peaceful death-scene. At his own request, his mortal remains were laid in the rural churchyard, near the ancient manor on which he had dwelt so long, and among the people he loved so well. The burial service was performed in the humble parish church, and the mourning peasantry attended with one accord the last sad tribute to their illustrious

friend. A plain wooden cross marks the place of his interment. He died childless.

We have thus briefly reviewed the life of one whose name, known wherever civilization has given a zest to political philosophy, is held in peculiar respect on this side of the Atlantic. Before his day, little comparatively was known on the Continent with regard to the structure of our government, and its application of republican principles. To him we owe lasting gratitude for having led his age to an intelligent contemplation of our system, and for setting in a just light before the world the benefits and evils of democratic policy. It is not, however, to be inferred, because he devoted so much time and labor to the study of the principles of democracy, that he was an advocate of that form of government. He always regarded the constitutional monarchy of England as the polity which combined in the greatest perfection a just freedom for the subject with due power in the executive. He believed the tendencies of the age in which he lived to be toward the unlimited supremacy of the popular element ; but he was persuaded of what events repeatedly verified, that the character of the French was not harmonious with the idea of unrestrained popular power. He aptly perceived that the causes which tended to strengthen republicanism in America could never so operate in his own country. For that reason he concluded that, while democracy in America was freedom, democracy in France was despotism. He wished to see in France a strong central government, not distracted by the independent influence of a landed aristocracy, and not interfering beyond its proper sphere ; a just control over municipal matters given to municipal authorities ; a generous extension of political rights, and a broad tolerance of individual action. But such an establishment, he readily perceived, must be the work of time ; revolution could not effect it ; a sudden change of administration or policy could not produce it ; it must be ingrafted by gradual and cautious innovations, the more potent because the less perceptible. In the revolutions of which he had been a witness, he saw that all the elements of intelligence, morality, religion, and learning had been conservative ; while the depravity of the nation, the wild, atheistic, visionary

fanatics, composed the elements of which the reforming spirit was made up. He knew that the former class of men were indispensable auxiliaries to the gradual change he was desirous of producing, and hence looked with great sorrow upon the violent convulsions which shook France from time to time. From these opinions we are enabled to arrive at the reason why he was never a strong party man. Looking beyond the ephemeral principles which controlled the policy of different factions, he could not bring himself to sympathize heartily with either extreme. Perceiving the salutary influence of a systematic opposition in England, he ranged himself with Barrot and Thiers, rather to maintain an equipoise than because his opinions sympathized with those of the statesmen with whom he acted. With his views, as we now understand them, for a test, his whole political course becomes consistent and highly virtuous.

If we consider his social character, we find that the gravity of the philosopher did not intrude upon his private relations; for in the companionship of those he loved, he both conversed freely and listened with respectful attention to others. He was cheerful and unassuming, readily pleased, and always anxious to please. The dignity of his vocations did not preclude him from the good-will of the humble. His candor rather elicited esteem than provoked irritation, and his piety, always constant and sometimes glowing, was yet not austere, but was indulgent of those pleasures which morality permits. The same substantial vigor and brilliancy which mark his writings shone forth in his conversation, which instructed while it entertained, and engaged both mind and heart by its lofty and yet sympathetic tone. Few men have been so remarkable as he for colloquial power; and, although he did not exhibit the rich fund of thought and fancy in which his mind abounded except to his friends, the renown of his conversational gifts almost equals that of his published works. His complaisance disarmed the surliest rival, yet his pride scorned a slavish submission to any. Possessing faculties of understanding naturally quick, he made them pre-eminent by study, and still more by observation and reflection. His imagination was active and exuberant, while it co-operated with,

but seldom predominated over, his judgment. So vigorous was his spirit, that it rose in rebellion against the sedentary and monotonous labors of his younger days. He continually longed for bodily or mental excitement, and on one occasion he wrote to a near friend, "The desire for strong emotions becomes irresistible, and my mind preys upon itself if it is not satisfied." Throughout his early correspondence the same restless disposition is discernible. He was continually complaining of want of excitement, and yearning for a life of intense activity. He thought that "life has no period of rest; man is a traveller toward a colder and colder region, and the higher his latitude, the faster ought to be his walk!" Although lapse of years and a large harvest of experience cooled his fervid temper, he continued through life to labor with energy and intensity. Graceful in his manners, firm in opinion, susceptible in feeling, quick and true in judgment, versatile in accomplishments, he was a delightful companion, a wise counsellor, a faithful friend, and an affectionate son, brother, and husband.

He fulfilled his moral and religious duties with promptness and zeal. Appreciating the inestimable value of order, he preserved complete method in all his transactions. While he has instructed the world by the depth and accuracy of his researches in political science, he has also left an enviable reputation for many exalted virtues, which appear to have adorned his career from his first entrance upon the duties of life.

It is a noticeable feature of his works, that his mind was continually directed to a specific object; and that he never indulges in that theoretical speculation which either rejects facts or is incapable of practical application. He always looked forward to a direct result. Rejecting all assistance from the perusal of other writers, and disdaining to lay the basis of his own productions on materials derived from libraries, he endeavored to strike out on untrodden paths, which, being discovered by actual observation and experience, might lead directly to the consequences sought. He did not regard with favor the intricate disputes of mental science, in which he took no pains to be well versed. His mind being morbidly

restless, he was absorbed in harassing thought, mingled with doubt, despondency, and gloom. But in none of his dark moods did a doubt arise as to the truth of religion and the sacredness of moral obligation. It was the great political themes on which he so constantly meditated that led him to those painful reveries.

His oratory toward the close of his parliamentary career was serious, and often brilliant. He spoke with composure, and yet with feeling, when he attempted to address the Chamber, which was seldom. Careless about arranging his thoughts and expressions so that they might be comprehended, he used few words, and avoided repetition and expansion. He never could have made a popular orator, for he had not the faculty of so combining commonplace with solid thought that his audience could sympathize with what he was saying. At the same time, his weak voice and feeble constitution were perpetual restraints upon his oratory.

He seems to have far transcended the French standard of character in the soberness and depth of his speculations, and in his insight into the mysteries of political science. But his restlessness, his warm temper, his impetuous vehemence, and his affability, mark him as a true Frenchman. When we look upon him as the philosopher, witnessing, not without emotion, indeed, but calmly and thoughtfully, the great convulsions through which his age was passing, noticing the operation of every cause and the influence of every result, treasuring up the painful experience thus acquired for the future service of the nation, and searching, while the facts were new, for some remedy for the disorder, it must be confessed that few Frenchmen have exhibited to the world such rare proofs of judgment, profound reflection, and substantial good sense.

In his personal appearance he was small and thin, with a remarkably pale countenance, which was lighted up with a pair of highly intelligent and fiery black eyes. His face was intellectual, and its expression betokened the restless mind within.

Besides "Democracy in America," by which his fame as a writer will mainly live, he undertook several other works, which, as far as he carried them, evince the same vigorous intellect. "*L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*," which has

already been noticed, was a philosophical survey of the old dynasty, and the events which placed the first Napoleon on the imperial throne. The success of the first volume, which was all that he completed, was equalled only by that of "Democracy in America." It was at once translated into many languages. Congratulatory letters reached him from the most eminent men of the age, and the appreciation of its merits doubtless procured for him a more cordial reception in England.

The first volume of De Beaumont's Memoir contains two articles from De Tocqueville's unfinished works, which are especially worthy of perusal. The first is "France before the Revolution," in which the author reverts to the position and influence of the *noblesse*, in the early part of the eighteenth century; their gradual decline, caused by the subdivisions of property, the growing importance of the middle classes, and the jealousy of every other rank of society; the gradual union of crown and people, and thence the centralizing tendency of democratic ideas; and the final extinction of the nobles as a power in the state, followed by a direct antagonism between regal and popular power. The other is "France before the Consulate," in which are set forth the wretched administration of the Directory that succeeded the "Reign of Terror"; the relapse of the people into a cowardly apathy, their indifference to republicanism, their hatred of the ancient *régime*, and equally of Jacobin anarchy; and their final acquiescence in the orderly and stringent government of the Consulate and Empire.

De Tocqueville had formerly undertaken a work, which was never matured, concerning the establishment of England in India, a subject which deeply interested him. In 1836, he wrote an article for the Westminster Review, which was translated by the able editor, Mr. J. S. Mill. In 1847 he furnished an historical account of Cherbourg, for Guilbert's "Histoire des Villes de France." Still later, he sent to the London Times his impressions of the *coup d'état* of the 2d of December, which may be found in the second volume of the translation of De Beaumont's Memoir. Other labors he commenced, but never submitted to the public. Many of his letters (none

of which were written for publication) have not been printed; some of them, because of the restrictions on the French press; but the greater part, because those to whom they were addressed were unwilling to expose the confidential testimonies of private friendship.

In closing, we are glad to announce that the American edition — we might almost say translation — of the “Democracy in America,” will shortly appear. Mr. Reeve’s version is, indeed, the basis for this issue; but it needed so many corrections and improvements as to have made Professor Bowen’s task hardly less arduous than a first-hand translation would have been. His fidelity and accuracy leave nothing to be desired. His notes, too, form an important and valuable feature of this edition, which bears, withal, in typography and mechanical execution, ample testimony to the liberal enterprise of the publisher.

ART. VII. — *Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History.*

BY CHRISTIAN CHARLES JOSIAS BUNSEN, D. C. L. London. 1854. 2 vols.

THE philosophy which thinks of history in relation to *all* humanity is a modern conception. We propose to sketch some of the most prominent theories to which this conception has given birth. They can, we think, be reduced to three, — the Theistic, the Idealistic, and the Realistic.

The Theistic theory has for its special principle belief in a living, supreme, personal, perfect, one, infinite, eternal God, by whose power the universe exists, by whose providence its events are ordered or overruled. This is the idea which comes nearest to our religious nature, — the idea which, as the most spontaneous and the most lasting, enlivens our childhood and comforts our age. This was the idea which Bossuet had for his inspiration, when in lofty argument he reasoned on what is transient in its relation to what is immortal. He was one of the first to look comprehensively at the historic life of humanity; and he grandly expounds the Theistic system in